

Appl. No. 10/608,885
Response Dated October 5, 2005
Reply to Action of July 13, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The undersigned would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for his time and comments at the interview of September 27, 2005.

In the Office Action of July 13, 2005, claims 1-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being described in Lavery et al. (6,362,895). At the interview, the undersigned presented arguments distinguishing Lavery from the claimed invention. The Examiner requested that the arguments be summarized in a written response to the July 13, 2005 action.

Lavery and the present application both disclose internet-based systems allowing a user to create a custom printed product. The methods used to accomplish this outcome, however, are completely different. In a nutshell, Lavery teaches a system that creates a custom product design at the server by receiving user data (e.g., name, title, phone number) from the user's computer and combining the user-supplied data with predefined document design elements according to predefined rules stored at the server. Applicants, by contrast, claim methods involving downloading design tools and a product design template to the user's computer and allowing the user to enter content into the template at the user's computer to create the user's custom document.

Lavery describes a system that is particularly useful to corporations or other organizations that want to provide an internet-based means for employees to obtain individualized printed products, such as personalized business cards, while at the same time ensuring that the employees do not create products that deviate from the standard corporate style and approved document design. As a part of the initial set up of the system for use by its employees, the employer stores at the server a set of approved

Appl. No. 10/608,885
Response Dated October 5, 2005
Reply to Action of July 13, 2005

product formats, colors, content, layouts, fonts, and so forth, and procurement rules related to authorization, purchasing, billing, and delivery policies. (col. 19, lines 8-22; element 460 in Fig. 5; elements 496 and element 491 in Fig. 6) When an individual employee desires to interact with the Lavery system to create a personalized product, the employee must input data according to data prompts in a pre-configured online order form to supply the required data to the server. (col. 9, lines 49-51 and 62-65) The user-supplied data is transmitted to the server where the data is combined with predefined product design information according to the predetermined rules established by the user's employer. After the server has created the product design, the server creates a PDF of the design, which is sent back to the user for review (col. 10, lines 1-8). If the user is not satisfied with the product design shown in the PDF received from the server, the user must again view and edit the order form and resubmit the data to the server to start the PDF creation and review process at the server again (col. 10, lines 14-17).

Applicants' independent claims 1, 9 and 13 claim methods, not described in Lavery, for allowing a user to access a web site, download product design software tools to the user computer, and use the downloaded tools to edit a selected product design template to complete an individualized and personalized product design at the user's computer. (paragraphs [0050] and [0069]; Figs. 4H-4N)

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-73 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

In the action of July 13, 2005, the Examiner supplied specific comments applying Lavery individually against claims 1-8 and 16-30. Remaining claims 9-15 and 31-73 were collectively characterized as being covered by the limitations of claims 1-8 and 16-30 and were not individually addressed. If, after reviewing the above comments, the Examiner intends to maintain the rejection of the claims, the

Appl. No. 10/608,885
Response Dated October 5, 2005
Reply to Action of July 13, 2005

Examiner is respectfully requested to clarify the basis for the rejection of pending claims 35-41, 51-61, and 70-73. Claims 35-41 and 51-61 relate to methods wherein the product design is created with the support of a design assistant. Claims 70-73 relate to methods wherein a design template is created for a user based on user information and the template is then made available to the user for use by the user in creating a design. Claims 1-8 and 16-30 do not include either of these features.

A replacement Abstract that is more descriptive of the claimed invention is provided.

If the Examiner believes a telephone call would serve advance the prosecution of this case, he is invited to call the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 5, 2005

Robert Dulaney, Reg. No. 28071
VistaPrint USA Inc.
100 Hayden Avenue
Lexington, MA 02421
Phone: 781-547-6360
Fax: 781-577-7208